



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

becoming *nn* in Latin, phonetically, may not the principle of adaptation have had some influence here, making *grunnire* (the usual form, by the way, in the Voces animantium) conform to *hinnire*, *tinnire*, *gannire*, *fritinnire*, *grinnire*, and other similar words? cf. Loewe, Rhein. Mus. 34, p. 494. The principle of the invariability of phonetic law is sometimes urged too far, as, e. g., in the unwillingness (p. 223) to fully equate *meridie* with *medidie*.

In the note on *triumphus*, p. 230, Conway has neglected to note that the "supposed derivation" from *τρι* and *ὀμφή* has actually been espoused by Stowasser, Dunkle Wörter, p. 12, and Sonny, Arch. f. lat. Lex. VIII, p. 132.

In passing I may note that the archaic inscriptions to Hercules from Praeneste 285 and 286, whose present location is not noted, are to be found in Rome in the Museo delle Terme (Chiostro Ala II, Casetta E).

The second volume gives an account of the alphabets, an outline, concise but clear, of the grammar of the dialects, a brief sketch of the syntax, an appendix with alien, spurious or doubtful inscriptions, indices of proper names, geographical and personal, a glossary of the dialects, and an index of Latin words. The latter is not quite as full as we could have wished. The glossary seems reasonably complete, although in the case of doubtful words (e. g. *ὑψυν*) it does not always give explanations proposed elsewhere by Conway himself and others. Under *Maesio—Pappus Maesius*, the reference to 255, p. 273, is omitted. Cicirrus (cf. Dietrich, Pulcinella, p. 95) is not included.

The usefulness of the work would have been greatly increased, it seems to us, if a Latin or English translation had been added of the inscriptions whose interpretation is reasonably certain.

In the list of books, p. xx, we find Kaibel's *Inscriptiones Graecae, Italiae et Sardiniae* (the correct title, with *Siciliae* for *Sardiniae*, is given p. xxv).

We cannot take leave of the work without expressing the wish that it may find a place in the library of many Latin scholars, and so extend and increase the interest in the study of the dialects.

MINTON WARREN.

Selected Letters of Cicero. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by FRANK FROST ABBOTT, Professor of Latin in the University of Chicago. Boston, U. S. A., and London, Ginn & Co., 1897.

Prof. Abbott has performed with tact and judgment the task of selection, as to the difficulty of which he speaks feelingly in his preface; the letters of Cicero himself given in this edition well illustrate both the varied interests of the writer and the variations in his epistolary style, and of those from his correspondents all

the best are included. The introduction is close packed with information for the student, the critical appendix is useful within its brief limits, and the indices are most welcome. The commentary, printed below the text, after the sensible fashion of the series, displays Prof. Abbott's sound scholarship and intimate knowledge of his author and reveals the wise moderation of a commentator who knows when to keep silence; the notes are always helpful and sufficient, never superabundant or overloaded. Occasionally a slight change in expression would tend to greater clearness; it is rarely possible to question the statements or dissent from the judgment of the editor.

A few points of disagreement may be briefly noted. In the introduction, §84 (δ), the common view that *vis c. inf.* is a 'polite' substitute for the imperative is illustrated by an example which goes far to disprove it: Sulpic. Fam. 4. 5. 4 *visne tu te, Servi, cohibere?* One would like more proof for the statement, in the same paragraph, that "the present subjunctive of the definite second person singular in positive commands is of rather frequent occurrence, especially in closing formulae"; in the two cases cited, Fam. 16. 9. 4, Att. 16. 7. 8, I should prefer to follow Baiter and Mendelssohn in treating the subjunctives as dependent, and certainly the common forms of ending a letter, *cura ut valeas* and the like, favor a different theory. In Att. 1. 16. 3 *fuit* is surely to be supplied not with *sic* but with *incredibili exitu*; for the position of the adverb cf. Planc. 21, de Or. 3. 29. It may be doubted if Caelius used *vapulasse*, Fam. 8. 1. 4, with comic intention; but by treating *palam secreto*, in the same passage, as a case of asyndeton, we miss a probable touch of humor. To speak of *qui*, Fam. 2. 16. 2, as an 'archaic ablative' is inexact, since the form is here used adverbially; in *propinquos ac familiares*, Fam. 4. 5. 1, we have no looseness of construction, but merely the common incorporation of the antecedent remarked on in the note to Fam. 14. 2. 3, "*Illud doleo*, etc."; in Fam. 11. 28. 1 *laborabam* is a verb of endeavor, not of distress, and *quia* is therefore quite normal. In Att. 8. 3. 3 *hoc* refers only to *relinquenda patria*; ib. 5, hortatory seems hardly the correct term for the subjunctive *utamur*; ib. 6, with *malle*, not *perire* but *id fieri* is to be supplied. The observation, in the note to Fam. 11. 1. 3, that *novissimus* = *extremus* does not occur in Caesar, is of course true only of the metaphorical significations; and the adverb *novissime* should be cited as a parallel to *novissimum tempus* in §4, rather than to *novissima auxilia*. *Si intellexero*, Fam. 3. 2. 2, is not temporal, so that Böckel's rule, cited on Att. 2. 22. 5 and here referred to, must be extended; cf. Fam. 2. 6. 5, where *si impertraro*, clearly not temporal, shows the same resistance to the influence of the infinitive. It would have been well not to cite without correction the inaccurately phrased observations of Tyrrell on *invitatu*, Fam. 7. 5. 2, and of Böckel on *par . . . bonitate*, Fam. 11. 28. 1. In §2 of this last letter occurs twice the misprint *necessari* for *-ii*.

In that part of the introduction which deals with Cicero's life and with the public events of his time, Prof. Abbott does not let himself be tempted into literary display, but writes with the somewhat careless vigor of a scholar to whom matter is more important than manner. His defence of Cicero as a statesman is not more convincing than previous attempts of the same kind; we do more justice to the great master of style and exponent of culture by recognizing that disparity between his political ambition and his political capacity, which constitutes the tragic element in his career and thus contributes largely to the interest and sympathy which he inspires. The editor is unwittingly cruel when he goes out of his way to combat the unreasonable suggestion that Cicero should have reorganized Cilicia as Caesar reorganized Gaul, and excuses him for not doing so by pleading "the shortness of his tenure of office and the wretchedness of the aristocratic system of government"; we cannot but remember that the first corresponded to Cicero's own passionate desire and that the second was what he tried to perpetuate.

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY.

WM. HAMILTON KIRK.

Les désinences verbales en *r* en Sanskrit, en Italique et en Celtique, par GEORGES DOTTIN. Rennes, 1896.

This admirable book adds nothing to our knowledge, for its final result is negative: 'there were Aryan verb-endings in *-r-*, not one of which is certainly preserved in its entirety in any of the derived languages.' Our author even believes that the passive-deponent *r*-forms of Italic and Celtic are independent creations (p. 376), and do not help to support the case for an Italo-Celtic unity.

The volume shows how one's theories may differ from one's practice. The writer does not believe in the perfect phonetic normality of the orthography of the ancient languages (p. xiv); he believes that the only linguistic unity is of the individual (p. xviii); he believes that the primitive Aryan was full of dialects. He will have none of glottogonic methods, however (p. xvii), and emphatically protests against the identification of Sanskrit 3d plur. *-ur* with the gen.-abl. sing. in *-ur* (p. 14). On this point he seems not to have seen this reviewer's comparison of 3d sg. *-et* with the abl.-gen. *-et* (Am. Jour. Phil. XV, p. 416), nor his explanation (ib., pp. 415, 432) of how 3d plur. *-ur* and gen.-abl. *-ur* might have had a common origin. This would, doubtless, not have made any difference in the author's views. Johansson, in advancing the proposition of the identity of these noun- and verb-endings (B. B. XVIII, p. 49), does not go into any explanatory detail, and, for my own part, I cannot see any direct road from the one to the other. In the article referred to (cf. also vol.